



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/780,804	02/09/2001	David L. Goodale	2048-039	8653

22471 7590 03/27/2003

PATENT LEGAL DEPARTMENT/A-42-C
BECKMAN COULTER, INC.
4300 N. HARBOR BOULEVARD
BOX 3100
FULLERTON, CA 92834-3100

EXAMINER

QUAN, ELIZABETH S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/780,804

Applicant(s)

GOODALE ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth Quan

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 21-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5,6. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-10 and 21-30, drawn to an apparatus for piercing container caps, classified in class 422, subclass 99.
 - II. Claims 11-20, drawn to an apparatus for piercing container caps, classified in class 422, subclass 99.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination, specifically means for moving the blade to pierce a cap on a container, does not recite nor require the particulars of the subcombination, specifically a latch assembly for latching a device to prevent the container from being moved by friction with the blade when the blade is being withdrawn from a pierced cap. The subcombination has separate utility such as an automatic synthesizer, dispenser, analyzer, can opener, or corkscrew.
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. During a telephone conversation with Wei-ning Yang on 2/24/2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-10 and 21-30. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Specification

7. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the blade with a z-shaped cross-section must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is unclear how the alignment block assembly restrains the container when the piercing blade is being withdrawn after piercing a cap. The alignment block assembly never comes into contact with the container. Neither the specification nor drawings explain the phenomena.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. Referring to claims 1 and 21, it does not appear that the blade as a z-shaped cross-section from FIG. 10 in the Applicant's drawings. Either "z-shaped" is an inaccurate description or the

drawings do not show the claimed subject matter. The blade in FIG. 10 of immediate application is a zigzagged cross-section.

14. Referring to claims 4 and 24, it is unclear how the alignment block assembly restrains the container when the piercing blade is being withdrawn after piercing a cap. The alignment block assembly never comes into contact with the container.

15. While applicant may be his or her own lexicographer, a term in a claim may not be given a meaning repugnant to the usual meaning of that term. See *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). The term "trigger" in claims 6, 7, 26, and 27 is used by the claim to mean "a block that moves up and down," while the accepted meaning is "a piece (as a lever) connected with a catch or detent as a means of releasing it."

16. Referring to claims 7 and 27, it is unclear whether the latch assembly, actuator, or trigger has locking means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

18. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11-285589 to Ishibashi.

Referring to claim 1, Ishibashi discloses a shaving razor (1) with a blade (4) with a z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section (see FIGURE). The razor (1) has a means (2) for moving the blade (see FIGURE). It is noted that the preamble has been construed as

intended use does not have patentable moment in apparatus claims. Furthermore, the limitation "to pierce a cap on a container" is a manner of operating the device and does not differentiate the apparatus claims from the prior art if the prior art apparatus teaches or suggests all the structural limitations of the claim (MPEP 2114). Therefore, Ishibashi includes all the limitations in claim 1.

19. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 96/15062 to Ferrari.

Referring to claims 1-10 and 21-30, Ferrari discloses an apparatus (1) for piercing container caps comprising a blade (13) with a generally z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section and means for moving the blade (13) to pierce a cap on a container (see ABSTRACT; FIGS. 1-3). The blade (13) has at least one sharpened tip for piercing a cap of a container and spreading the load applied on the blade (13) since the blade (13) penetrates the cork and a cap (19) is inserted at the bottom on the bottom of the guide bars (see FIGS. 1-3; PAGE 8, lines 1-4). The means for moving the blade comprises a carriage assembly for moving the blade and means for driving the carriage assembly (see FIGS. 1-3). An alignment block assembly (27) restrains the container when the piercing blade (13) is being withdrawn after piercing a cap (see FIGS. 1-3; PAGE 6, lines 3-25; PAGES 7-10). A latch assembly latches the alignment block assembly when the piercing the blade is being withdrawn from a pierced cap to prevent the container from being moved by friction with the withdrawn blade (see FIG. 3). The latch assembly comprises a trigger (4) movable between a latching position when the piercing blade is being withdrawn from a pierced cap and an unlatched position after the piercing blade has been

with drawn from the pierced cap (see FIGS. 1-3). The latch assembly has an actuator engaged with the trigger (4) and having locking means, such that when the trigger (4) moves to the latching position, the actuator causes its locking means to matingly lock with a complimentary locking means to latch the alignment assembly and when the trigger (4) moves to the unlatched position, the actuator causes its locking means to unlock from the fixed complimentary locking means to unlatch the alignment assembly (27). According to Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, to lock is defined as to fix in a particular situation, or to make fast, motionless, or inflexible especially by the interlacing or interlocking of parts. Therefore, the locking means are matingly locked with a fixed complimentary locking means when movement of the alignment block assembly (27) is ceased and the locking means are unlocked from the fixed complimentary locking means when the alignment block assembly (27) moves. The locking means and fixed complimentary locking means comprise of teeth (see FIGS 1-3). The Applicant has not distinguished between gear rack teeth and saw teeth. It appears that that the Applicant is differentiating the teeth by different methods of making teeth. It is noted that method limitations hold no patentable weight in apparatus claims if the prior art teaches or suggests the structural limitations. The actuator is spring-biased (16,17,18) (see FIGS. 1-3; PAGE 4, lines 17-23). Therefore, Ferrari includes all the limitations in claims 1-11 and 21-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1743

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

22. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

23. Claims 1-9 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 884 575 to McCandless et al. (Interpretation 2) in view of DE 523569 to Lafarge.

Referring to claims 1-9 and 21-29, McCandless et al. disclose an apparatus for piercing container caps (see ABSTRACT; FIGS. 3-5). The apparatus comprises a piercing blade (60) with a tip (160) having a sharpened three-edge point (162) and means (30) for moving the blade (60) to pierce a cap (14) on a container (12) (see ABSTRACT; FIGS. 3-5; COL. 10, line 58; COL. 11, line 1). The means (30) for moving the blade

assembly comprises a carriage assembly for moving the blade and means for driving the carriage assembly (see FIG. 4; COL. 9, lines 9-18). An alignment block assembly (58) restrains the container by a latch assembly within cantilever arm (50) when the piercing blade (60) is being withdrawn after piercing a cap to prevent the container from being moved with the withdrawn blade by friction (see FIG. 4; COL. 9, lines 9-39). The latch assembly has a trigger (54) movable between a latching position when the piercing blade is being withdrawn from a pierced cap and an unlatched position after the piercing blade has been withdrawn from the pierced cap since the trigger (54) provides movement to the alignment block assembly (58) (see COL. 9, lines 14-18 and 29-35). The latch assembly has an actuator (55) engaged with the trigger (56) and having locking means, such that when the trigger (56) moves to the latching position, the actuator causes its locking means to matingly lock with a complimentary locking means to latch the alignment assembly and when the trigger (56) moves to the unlatched position, the actuator causes its locking means to unlock from the fixed complimentary locking means to unlatch the alignment assembly (58). According to Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, to lock is defined as to fix in a particular situation, or to make fast, motionless, or inflexible especially by the interlacing or interlocking of parts. Therefore, the locking means are matingly locked with a fixed complimentary locking means when movement of the alignment block assembly (58) is ceased and the locking means are unlocked from the fixed complimentary locking means when the alignment block assembly (58) moves. The locking means and fixed complimentary locking means comprise of teeth (see FIG. 4). The Applicant has not distinguished between gear rack teeth and saw teeth. It

appears that that the Applicant is differentiating the teeth by different methods of making teeth. It is noted that method limitations hold no patentable weight in apparatus claims if the prior art teaches or suggests the structural limitations.

McCandless et al. do not disclose the cross-section of the blade. However, Lafarge shows a blade with a generally z-shaped cross-section with a bend or transverse carrier (7) between the portion (6) of the tip closest to the cork part (3) and end (8) of the tip (see FIGURE). The edges of portion (6) and straight edge forming the end of the tip (8) are parallel to each other, as shown in the FIGURE as portions shaded in by pencil. Lafarge discloses that the z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section of the blade prevents scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container. The bend or transverse carrier (7) also prevents from total insertion of the blade and provides easy removal of the blade from the container. Since the blade fulfills the function of piercing the cap and spreading the load applied on the blade, the blade with at least one sharpened tip is intrinsic to the blade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the piercing apparatus of McCandless et al. to provide a blade of z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section as in Lafarge to prevent scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container and total insertion of the blade and provide easy removal of the blade from the container.

24. Claims 1, 3-10, 21, and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,213,764 to Kerr et al. in view of DE 523569 to Lafarge.

Referring to claims 1, 3-10, 21, and 23-30, Kerr et al. disclose an apparatus for piercing container caps (see ABSTRACT; FIGS. 9-11). The apparatus comprises a

piercing blade (70) and means (16) for moving the blade (70) to pierce a cap on a container (see FIGS. 9-11). The means (16) for moving the blade assembly comprises a carriage assembly for moving the blade and means for driving the carriage assembly (see FIGS. 9-11). An alignment block assembly (334) restrains the container by a latch assembly when the piercing blade (70) is being withdrawn after piercing a cap to prevent the container from being moved with the withdrawn blade by friction (see FIGS. 9-11). The latch assembly has a trigger (374,376,378) movable between a latching position when the piercing blade is being withdrawn from a pierced cap and an unlatched position after the piercing blade has been withdrawn from the pierced cap (see FIGS. 9-11). The latch assembly has an actuator (386) engaged with the trigger and having locking means, such that when the trigger moves to the latching position, the actuator causes its locking means to matingly lock with a complimentary locking means to latch the alignment assembly and when the trigger moves to the unlatched position, the actuator causes its locking means to unlock from the fixed complimentary locking means to unlatch the alignment assembly (334). According to Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, to lock is defined as to fix in a particular situation, or to make fast, motionless, or inflexible especially by the interlacing or interlocking of parts. Therefore, the locking means are matingly locked with a fixed complimentary locking means when movement of the alignment block assembly (334) or trigger is ceased and the locking means are unlocked from the fixed complimentary locking means when the alignment block assembly (334) or trigger moves. The locking means and fixed complimentary locking means comprise of teeth (see FIGS. 9-11). The Applicant has not distinguished between gear rack teeth

and saw teeth. It appears that that the Applicant is differentiating the teeth by different methods of making teeth. It is noted that method limitations hold no patentable weight in apparatus claims if the prior art teaches or suggests the structural limitations. The actuator (386) is spring-biased assures smooth transfer of movement from the trigger to the alignment block assembly (334) when the actuator (386) causes movement of the locking means and fixed locking means (see FIGS. 9-11; COL. 5, lines 3-9). FIG. 10 shows the actuator (386) against the spring.

Kerr et al. do not disclose the cross-section of the blade. However, Lafarge shows a blade with a generally z-shaped cross-section with a bend or transverse carrier (7) between the portion (6) of the tip closest to the cork part (3) and end (8) of the tip (see FIGURE). The edges of portion (6) and straight edge forming the end of the tip (8) are parallel to each other, as shown in the FIGURE as portions shaded in by pencil. Lafarge discloses that the z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section of the blade prevents scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container. The bend or transverse carrier (7) also prevents from total insertion of the blade and provides easy removal of the blade from the container. Since the blade fulfills the function of piercing the cap and spreading the load applied on the blade, the blade with at least one sharpened tip is intrinsic to the blade. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the piercing apparatus of Kerr et al. to provide a blade of z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section as in Lafarge to prevent scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container and total insertion of the blade and provide easy removal of the blade from the container.

25. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over copending Application No. 09/599305 which has common inventors and assignee with the instant application in view of DE 523569 to Lafarge. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) if published or patented. This provisional rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is based upon a presumption of future publication or patenting of the conflicting application. Claims 1-53 of Application 09/599305 essentially covers the limitations of 1-10 and 21-30 of the immediate application except for the blade with a z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section. Lafarge discloses that the z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section of the blade prevents scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container. The bend or transverse carrier (7) also prevents from total insertion of the blade and provides easy removal of the blade from the container. Since the blade fulfills the function of piercing the cap and spreading the load applied on the blade, the blade with at least one sharpened tip is intrinsic to the blade. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the piercing apparatus to provide a blade of z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section as in Lafarge to prevent scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container and total insertion of the blade and provide easy removal of the blade from the container.

This provisional rejection might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the copending application was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by a showing of a date of invention for the instant application prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the copending application under 37 CFR 1.131. For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this

rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Double Patenting

26. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

27. Claims 1-10 and 21-30 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-53 of commonly assigned 09/599305. Specifically, claims 1-53 of Application 09/599305 essentially covers the limitations of 1-10 and 21-30 of the immediate application except for the blade with a z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section. Lafarge discloses that the z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section of the blade prevents scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container. The bend or transverse carrier (7) also prevents from total insertion of the blade and provides easy removal of the blade from the container. Since the blade fulfills the function of piercing the cap and spreading the load applied on the blade, the blade with at least one sharpened tip is intrinsic to the blade. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the piercing apparatus to provide a blade of z-shaped or zigzagged cross-section as in Lafarge to prevent scrap material produced from piercing from falling inside the container and total insertion of the blade and provide easy removal of the blade from the container.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. They include one or more limitations in the claims.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Quan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1947. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Elizabeth Quan
Examiner
Art Unit 1743

eq
March 23, 2003


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700